



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/572,966	03/21/2006	Richard Eric Newbould	36-1963	4414
23117 7590 10/02/2008 NIXON & VANDERHYE, PC 901 NORTH GLEBE ROAD, 11TH FLOOR ARLINGTON, VA 22203				
EXAMINER KHOSHNOODI, NADIA				
ART UNIT 2137		PAPER NUMBER		
MAIL DATE 10/02/2008		DELIVERY MODE PAPER		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

### Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/572,966

**Applicant(s)**

NEWBOULD ET AL.

**Examiner**

NADIA KHOSHNOODI

**Art Unit**

2137

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 March 2007.  
2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.  
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are pending in the application.  
4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are rejected.  
7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 21 March 2006 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-8508)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 1/5-4-2006  
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_  
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application  
6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Specification***

#### **Title**

I. The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.

The following title is suggested: Providing Privacy for User-Profile Information from Service Providers.

II. The following guidelines illustrate the preferred layout for the specification of a utility application. These guidelines are suggested for the applicant's use.

#### **Arrangement of the Specification**

III. As provided in 37 CFR 1.77(b), the specification of a utility application should include the following sections in order. **Each of the lettered items should appear in upper case, without underlining or bold type, as a section heading.** If no text follows the section heading, the phrase "Not Applicable" should follow the section heading:

- (a) TITLE OF THE INVENTION.
- (b) CROSS-REFERENCE TO RELATED APPLICATIONS.
- (c) STATEMENT REGARDING FEDERALLY SPONSORED RESEARCH OR DEVELOPMENT.
- (d) THE NAMES OF THE PARTIES TO A JOINT RESEARCH AGREEMENT.
- (e) INCORPORATION-BY-REFERENCE OF MATERIAL SUBMITTED ON A COMPACT DISC.
- (f) BACKGROUND OF THE INVENTION.
  - (1) Field of the Invention.

- (2) Description of Related Art including information disclosed under 37 CFR 1.97 and 1.98.
- (g) BRIEF SUMMARY OF THE INVENTION.
- (h) BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF THE SEVERAL VIEWS OF THE DRAWING(S).
- (i) DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF THE INVENTION.
- (j) CLAIM OR CLAIMS (commencing on a separate sheet).
- (k) ABSTRACT OF THE DISCLOSURE (commencing on a separate sheet).
- (l) SEQUENCE LISTING (See MPEP § 2424 and 37 CFR 1.821-1.825. A "Sequence Listing" is required on paper if the application discloses a nucleotide or amino acid sequence as defined in 37 CFR 1.821(a) and if the required "Sequence Listing" is not submitted as an electronic document on compact disc).

*Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112*

- IV. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

- V. Claims 1-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

As per claim 1:

Applicants mention the phrase "...triggerable to allocate or cease a pseudo-identifier..." in lines 9-10. Although it is clear that a pseudo-identifier may be allocated, however, in the instance that it is "ceased" the meaning is unclear. In order to further treat these claims on their merits, Examiner presumes that Applicants intended to signify that the usage of the pseudo-identifier may be ceased with respect to a user in order to restrict access.

**\*\*Claims not specifically addressed are rejected by virtue of their dependency.**

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

VI. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

VII. Claims 1-12 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being fully anticipated by Nordman et al., US Patent No. 7,340,438.

As per claim 1:

Nordman et al. teach an apparatus comprising: a store for storing profile data for use in relation to said online services (col. 5, lines 16-21 and col. 8, lines 55-61); an interface for use by suppliers of online services to enable retrieval from and input to said store of profile data in respect of users (col. 6, lines 10-18 and col. 8, lines 57-61); identity management means (col. 14, lines 12-64 and col. 19, lines 51-62); and a profile access controller arranged to implement user-defined access controls in respect of a user's stored profile data (col. 6, lines 51-63), wherein said identity management means are triggerable to allocate or to cease a pseudo-identifier in respect of a user and a selected service provider and wherein, in use, said profile access controller restricts access by the selected service provider to stored profile data in respect of said user by means of said pseudo-identifier (col. 6, lines 41-48 and col. 7, lines 5-14 & 50-60).

As per claim 2:

Nordman et al. teach an apparatus according to claim 1. Nordman et al. teach the apparatus further comprising monitoring means arranged with access to messages originating from a user and to recognise a predetermined type of information contained within said messages

Art Unit: 2137

(col. 9, lines 54-62).

As per claim 3:

Nordman et al. teach an apparatus according to claim 2. Nordman et al. teach the apparatus further comprising means responsive to a recognition by said monitoring means to replace information of said recognised type in a message originating from a user with pseudo-information generated by said identity management means in respect of said user (col. 17, lines 52-65 and col. 19, lines 63-67).

As per claim 4:

Nordman et al. teach an apparatus according to claim 2. Nordman et al. teach the apparatus operable, on receipt of a request message from a user for access to a specified service provider, to generate an access request message, for sending to said specified service provider, containing an identifier for said user allocated by said identity management means (col. 7, lines 5-14).

As per claim 5:

Nordman et al. teach an apparatus according to claim 4. Nordman et al. teach the apparatus wherein said allocated identifier for said user is a pseudo-identifier allocated by said identity management means (col. 7, lines 50-60).

As per claim 6:

Nordman et al. teach an apparatus according to claim 1. Nordman et al. teach the apparatus further comprising a user interface operable to enable a user to update respective profile data stored in said store and to define said access controls for implementation by said

profile access controller (col. 7, lines 31-49).

As per claim 7:

Nordman et al. teach an apparatus according to claim 1. Nordman et al. teach the apparatus wherein said profile access controller is operable to recognise at least one predetermined invalid access condition with respect to stored profile data for a user and wherein the identity management means are responsive to said recognition by said profile access controller, and/or to a trigger signal from the user, to render a pseudo-identifier invalid for a respective service provider and hence to disable access by the respective service provider to profile data stored in respect of the user (col. 21, lines 39-49 and col. 28, lines 4-21).

As per claim 8:

Nordman et al. teach an apparatus according to claim 1. Nordman et al. teach the apparatus for use in the role of a proxy server disposed between a user and a service provider (col. 6, lines 20-27).

As per claim 9:

Nordman et al. teach an apparatus according to claim 1. Nordman et al. teach the apparatus further comprising: profile data analysis means operable to identify, in stored profile data, information likely to compromise user anonymity (col. 24, lines 55-60).

As per claim 10:

Nordman et al. teach an apparatus according to claim 9. Nordman et al. teach the apparatus wherein the profile data analysis means are operable, on identifying information likely to compromise user anonymity, to generate a warning message (col. 34, lines 1-11).

As per claim 11:

Nordman et al. teach an apparatus according to claim 9. Nordman et al. teach the apparatus wherein the profile data analysis means are operable to compare a type of data stored by a service provider in respect of a user with a data type to which the user has granted access permission for that service provider (col. 24, lines 61-67).

As per claim 12:

Nordman et al. teach an apparatus according to claim 9. Nordman et al. teach the apparatus wherein the profile data analysis means are operable to detect distinctive characteristics in stored user profile data (col. 24, lines 35-67).

As per claim 15:

Nordman et al. teach an apparatus according to claim 1. Nordman et al. teach the apparatus wherein said identity management means is arranged to allocate a different pseudo-identifier in respect of a user in respect of each of a plurality of different service providers (col. 7, lines 5-14).

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

VIII. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

IX. Claims 13-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nordman et al., US Patent No. 7,340,438, as applied to claim 12 above, and further in view of Bohrer et al., US Pub. No. 2003/0088520.



As per claim 13:

Nordman et al. substantially teach an apparatus according to claim 12. Not explicitly disclosed is wherein the profile data analysis means are operable to detect said distinctive characteristics by comparing data contained in a user's profile with data contained in other user profiles. However, Bohrer et al. teach that two profiles may be compared to determine the level of privacy of each. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method disclosed in Nordman et al. to compare data contained in two profiles in order to determine various characteristics necessary to be present to achieve a certain level of privacy. This modification would have been obvious because a person having ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, would have been motivated to do so since Bohrer et al. suggest two profiles may be compared in order to determine a level of privacy and maintain that level of privacy within the system in par. 13.

As per claim 14:

Nordman et al. substantially teach an apparatus according to claim 12. Not explicitly disclosed is wherein the profile data analysis means are operable to detect said distinctive characteristics by comparing data contained in a user's profile with predetermined data characteristics stored in a reference store. However, Bohrer et al. teach that each site will have a predetermined privacy policy and comparing the user's profile privacy data with that site's data allows a determination to be made of whether or not the data in the user's profile is consistent with that of the site. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method disclosed in Nordman et al. to compare the user's profile to the reference store of another site to determine the privacy levels of various data

elements in the user's profile. This modification would have been obvious because a person having ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, would have been motivated to do so since Bohrer et al. suggest analyzing various privacy features in a user's profile in comparison to a site's policy to detect privacy levels and ensure privacy is maintained in par. 3.

*\*References Cited, Not Used*

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

1. US Patent No. 6,253,203
2. US Pub. No. 2002/0173295

The above references have been cited because they are relevant due to the manner in which the invention has been claimed.

***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nadia Khoshnoodi whose telephone number is (571) 272-3825. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F: 8:00-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Emmanuel Moise can be reached on (571) 272-3865. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

NK

/Nadia Khoshnoodi/  
Examiner, Art Unit 2137  
9/26/2008

/Emmanuel L. Moise/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2137